

REMARKS

Claims 23-42 and 44 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-22 were previously cancelled, and claim 43 has been cancelled herein. Claims 23-31, 34-42, and 44 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Claims 43 and 44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as assertedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. More particularly, the Office Action rejected claims 43 and 44 because the claims recite the term “in the future” for which the “present” time is not defined. Applicants, therefore, have amended claim 44 to recite, “wherein said start-time comprises a time value, the time value greater than a current time.” Applicants have also cancelled claim 43. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 23-44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as assertedly being anticipated by RFC 2131 – Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol (hereinafter “DHCP”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants have amended claim 23 to recite, “said guaranteeing being performed in advance of when said resources are allocated such that said start-time is later than a current time,” and amended claim 34 to recite, “said start-time being later than a current time.” The limitations are not taught or suggested by the cited reference. It should be noted that DHCP assigns IP addresses to clients the moment the request is received. It is not possible with DHCP to perform advance reservations of resources as recited in Applicants’ claims 23 and 34.

Applicants further note that the logic contained in the Office Action regarding the phrase “in the future” strains credibility. The Office Action asserts that the assignment of addresses happens in the future because “the assignment happens at a point after the server receives a client request.” Office Action, page 7. By doing so, the Office Action is essentially equating “immediately” to “in the future.” Clearly, DHCP immediately assigns the IP addresses the moment it receives a request. Despite this, the Office Action asserts that because the server cannot assign the IP addresses until after it receives the request, that this is by definition “in the future,” thereby equating “in the future” to “immediately.” “During patent examination, the pending claims must be ‘given their broadest *reasonable* interpretation *consistent with the specification*.’” MPEP § 2111 (citations omitted) (emphasis added). It should be noted that the current procedures and laws require that the claim interpretation be both reasonable and consistent with the specification. Equating “in the future” with “immediately” is neither *reasonable* nor *consistent with the specification*.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 23 and 34 be withdrawn. Claims 24-33 and 43 depend from and add further limitations to claim 23, and claims 35-42 and 44 depend from and add further limitations to claim 34. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Roger C. Knapp, Applicants' Attorney, at 972-732-1001 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. No fee is believed due in connection with this filing. However, should one be deemed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

February 20, 2009
Date

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75252
Tel.: 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218

/Roger C. Knapp/
Roger C. Knapp
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 46,836